

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
1	Section A - Executive Summary	JLTV Proposed Schedule	Will you provide specific months and years for the activities on the schedule, as well as durations (e.g. test)	No. This schedule is notional and subject to change, it is being provided as information only for the purposes of RFP.
2	Section A - Executive Summary	JLTV Proposed Schedule	Does the scope of the EMD DRFP deal only with EMD activities even though there are LRIP activities depicted (e.g. delivery of the 2 seat blast hull/rolling chassis)?	This Statement of Work (SOW) encompasses the Engineering, Manufacturing, and Development (EMD) phase of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) acquisition program only.
3	Section A - Executive Summary	Production Award and Potential Criteria	What is the criteria that will be used to execute the 5 year Option contract?	The selection criteria for the PD phase or a FRP decision has not yet been established.
4	Section A - Executive Summary	Page 3	"Prior to start of the LUT, the contractor must demonstrate the minimum Reliability value consistent with the ASA(ALT) EMD threshold of 70% reliability with 50% statistical confidence." Question - How will the reliability and confidence be calculated? Will this be the reliability of completing one mission? What mileage interval should be used to calculate the demonstrated reliability and confidence? Is this Hardware Mission Failure reliability?	Language revised/removed. See final RFP, Section A
5	Section A - Executive Summary	Cost Target pg 4	Will you provide the equation that the Govt uses to determine AUMC? What are the cost elements included and excluded?	See final RFP, Section C.1.3 for definition of AUMC
6	Section A - Executive Summary	Cost Target pg 4	What is the difference between the AUMC and UMC?	The AUMC refers to the average manufacturing cost of the entire family of vehicles. The UMC refers to the manufacturing cost for just one base vehicle platform in the family of vehicles. The UMC - GP configuration will be evaluated per section L.
7	Section A - Executive Summary	Acq Strat, pg 2	Are the appropriated funds available to support a 12 May award?	Yes
8	Section A - Executive Summary	International, pg 5	When do you anticipate Australia formally joining the program? Why are you asking us to put a plan together? Does the \$52M include Australian content? Does the anticipated volume of 20,750 vehicles include Australian content?	Final RFP does not include any AUS unique requirements. AIC Plan is not included in the SOW of final RFP. Refer to final RFP for updates to EMD base contract affordability ceiling and manufacturing cost assumptions.
9	Section A - Executive Summary		Given that the stated intention is to buy approximately 50000 JLTVs ; given the current challenges related to program funding and the program acquisition strategy ; given the significant pre- contract investment being asked of by Industry, why are you not permitting a total quantity of 50000 vehicles rather than 20750 vehicles to be used to determine the AUMC/UMC and spread the NRE and investment?	Refer to final RFP, Section A Page 4. The Production manufacturing assumptions in Attachment KK (revised since Draft RFP) correspond to the Government's intent to award a single Production contract consisting of a base three year LRIP with an option for a five year multi-year contract for FRP.
10	Executive Summary & Section M	Executive Summary Pg. 4 & Section M Pg. 23	The executive summary dated October 3, 2011 states on page 4 that, "Demonstrated performance above threshold will be considered more favorably as long as it is not done at the expense of compromising Tiered 1 PD requirements." Section M page 23 currently states that, "No evaluation credit will be given for exceeding the threshold requirements". Can Section M be modified to include evaluation credit for performance above threshold?	Refer to final RFP, Section A and Section L+M.

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
11	Executive Summary	Page 4	<p>Section L& M of the Government's "Industry Meeting - After Action Report" (posted to the JLTV EMD Website 19Oct11) states, "... Executive Summary Production strategy (page 4) of a single Production contract award consisting of a base three year LRIP with an option for a five year multi-year contract for FRP with possible re-competition after initial Production contract award."</p> <p>Q: What is meant by "five year multi-year contract"? Five, one-year contracts? One two-year and one three-year contract? Or some other division of five years into contract periods of performance that together total five years?</p>	Multi-Year contract, as described in FAR Part 17.1
12	Section B - CLINs	CLIN 0004	When will Section H, Special Provisions referenced in Section B, CLIN 0004, be provided?	Refer to final RFP for new CLIN structure and Section H provisions/clauses.
13	Section B - CLINs	CLIN 0004	When will labor hours associated with Section B, CLIN 0004 LOE be defined? Section M.4.5.1.2 currently reads 'xx,xxx hours'.	Refer to final RFP for new CLIN structure and Section H provisions/clauses.
14	Section B - CLINs	SubCLINS 0001AA, 0001AB and 0001AC	SubCLINS for Prototype Vehicles call for FF Unit Pricing for LHO or RHO. How can unit prices be the same for different configurations? The CLIN structure re LHO and RHO appears to conflict with the HGC variant in Attachment 37 - please clarify?	Refer to final RFP for new CLIN structure and Attachment 37
15	Section B - CLINs	CLIN 0004	Are we to interpret the term "supplies" to include material?	Yes
16	Section B	page 1	Will A-Kits be added as a sub-CLIN in Section B?	What was referred to in past Draft requirements documents as "A-Kits" is now called A-Structure Armor and is the integral or inherent level of protection and is part of Vehicle CLINs. "B-Kit" will have their own CLIN in section B.
17	Section B - CLINs	Section B, page 1, Item #0001AA, AB, ..., AM	During the Industry Day Meeting, it was understood that a Leader-Follower Process for Pricing delineation of the different vehicle prototypes and affiliated mission kits would be acceptable. However, the Contract Line Item breakout does not allow for that type of pricing visibility. Would the Leader-Follower Pricing be allowed and submitted against the various sub-CLINs?	No, pricing is required for each of the three (3) Base Vehicle Platforms (4-passenger GP, 4-passenger CCWC, & 2-passenger UTL). Each Base Vehicle Platform is identified under a separate CLIN. Refer to final RFP, Section B.
18	Section B - CLINs	Section B, page 2, Item #0003	If CLIN 0003 is the Line Item for all CDRLs on the program, why are the costs captured under CLIN 0002 and not priced separately under CLIN 0003?	Refer to final RFP for updated CLIN numbering. CLIN 0014 refers to the data items for Exhibit A Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) (only) pursuant to DFARS PGI 204-701, and the automated contract writing system TACOM uses. CLIN 0013 accounts for all supplies and services for all efforts, other than the build effort for the <u>Test Assets as described in the SOW</u>
19	Section B - CLINs	Section B, page 3, Item #0005	If CLIN 0005 is the Line Item for Contractor Manpower Reporting Requirements why are the costs captured under CLIN 0002 and not priced separately under CLIN 0005?	This is not separately priced CLIN. This is how the TACOM Acquisition office chose to structure this effort in Section B, however all the expenses should be accounted for under CLIN 0013 (as revised by the Final RFP).
20	Section C - SOW		We cannot locate a paint specification. Please clarify or provide.	The Purchase Description identifies the paint performance requirements. The color of paint is identified Section F.2.1 of final RFP.
21	Section C - SOW	1.4 Commonality	Did USG consider effects of requiring one variant (GP) to be able to handle any weight from light to heavy, a range of approx. 10,000 lbs? That is, in order to maximize commonality and still provide proper structure and strength at heavier weights, lighter vehicle will have additional cost and weight associated with it.	Yes
22	Section C - SOW	2.1.1 IPT Structure	Does the government want the schedule roll-up to the IPT structure?	Refer to the final RFP, Section C.4.5.1 for IMS requirements.

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
23	Section C - SOW	3.1.1 Agenda and Read-Ahead Packages	"The Contractor shall present cost & IMS information at meetings, conferences, and reviews IAW the IMP." The RFP needs to be more specific on the number of meetings.	Refer to final RFP, Section C.3 and Attachment 2.
24	Section C - SOW	3.12.1 Cost and IMS CDRL Data Reviews	"The Contractor shall conduct monthly reviews of the IMS and Funds and Man-Hours Expenditure Report at least two (2) days prior to each CDRL submittal date." According to CDRL A012, the IMS is submitted every week, not monthly. Is there a monthly IMS delivery?	Refer to final RFP Section 4.5.1, the IMS data shall also be discussed and any other major reviews in accordance with the IMP, and CDRL A012 shall be submitted twice monthly. Also refer to final RFP Section C.3.4: The IMS data shall be discussed during IPT level reviews.
25	Section C - SOW	3.12.3 CSDR Readiness Review	What should the statement read - NLT <i>three (4) weeks</i> listed, is it three or 4 or something else?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.3.12.2 for timing of CDSR Readiness Review
26	Section C - SOW	3.8 Manufacturing Readiness Assessment (MRA)	Is MRA applicable to Subcontractors?	The MRA is a meeting between the Government and the Contractor. Subcontractors may be involved as necessary to meet the exit criteria for the meeting.
27	Section C - SOW	4.2 (CSDR)	Is the 1921-3 Contract Business Data Report a contract requirement? This req't identified in Sect C but not incl. in Attach 5, the CDSR Plan.	Refer to final RFP, Section C.4.2 and Exhibit A, CDRL A007 for requirement. It is a requirement but is not part of the CSDR Plan (Attachment 5)
28	Section C - SOW	4.2 CSDRs	What is the reporting threshold for subcontractors? Prime Contractors are responsible for flowing down these CSDR requirements to all subcontractors meeting the reporting thresholds. This responsibility includes requiring subcontractors to electronically report directly to the DCARC.	From DFARS 252.234-7004 (b) "CSDR reporting will be required for subcontractors at any tier with a subcontract that exceeds \$50 million.
29	Section C - SOW	4.3.1 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)	"Additionally, it (the IMS) shall include fields and data that enable the Government to assess the information by product, process, and organizational lines or any combination. " Will the government supply a definition and list of the product, process, and organizational lines that they want coded in the schedule?	Organization/IPT codes, IMP codes and WBS codes shall be provided in schedule fields. These and all other fields are listed in Attachment 0049.
30	Section C - SOW	5.5.2.2 Weighing of All Deliverable Vehicles	Must all items be installed during the weighing process, If so must the items be installed and removed from the vehicle? Will weight distribution (Front/Rear axle loads) be required?	Refer to final RFP Section C.5.5.2.2; "Prior to delivery, the Contractor shall weigh each complete deliverable JLTV in its defined Curb Weight." The Government does not have Front/Rear axle load requirements, however the Contractor's design needs to support payloads in appropriate locations per the Contractor Load Plans.
31	Section C - SOW	6.2.5 Acoustic Data Sheet	Will acoustic/ NVH performance need to be provided through analysis or test data?	Refer to final RFP. Noise and Vibration Performance Data Sheet and CDRL A031 was removed.
32	Section C - SOW	17.5.4 FSR and SME Support for Ballistic Testing	Will the replacement parts required for the Ballistic/Blast testing be expected to come from the SSP or will there be another "repair kit" required from the contractor? The type of parts contained in a SSP may not be sufficient for repair of a <u>blast damaged vehicle</u> .	The SSP scope in the Draft RFP has been intentionally deleted to not prescribe the method by which a contractor is to supply all needed spare parts at each test site. Refer to Section C.17.5.3.
33	Section C - SOW	17.5.5.3.2 OCONUS SSP replenishment	SSP needs to be "available" at Contractor facility for pickup by PMO. What is the time frame allotted to identify, pull, process paperwork, etc. before pickup can occur? 24-48-72-96 hours, or??	There is no Australian/OCONUS requirements in the final RFP.
34	Section C - SOW	17.5.9 Armor Ballistic Test Data	Is the ballistic test data discussed in section 17.5.9 required to be from a Govt test site or can it be from a 3rd party test site?	Refer to final RFP, Armor Ballistic Test Data (CDRL A084) is not a requirement.
35	Section C - SOW	19.2 FRACAS	Subsystem testing required for all Critical and Major TIRS as substantiating evidence. Who will identify these tests, when, and how much time will be permitted to conduct the testing before providing input to close out the open TIR(s).	It will be up to Contractor to determine the depth of subsystem testing to be conducted and provided with the FACAR. Required FACAR timing is included in SOW in 19.3 TIR Response Time.

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
36	Section C - SOW	22.3	Are PFMEA's required as deliverables for Suppliers? The Contractor and their suppliers shall use the Automotive Industry Action Group (AIAG) FMEA manual (latest edition) as a guide to create all PFMEAs.	Refer to final RFP, Section 22.4, and CDRL A095. The contractor is required to deliver key PFMEA subsystems.
37	Section C - SOW	19.2 Failure Analysis & Corrective Actions	What are the Definitions of Failure Modes A, BC and BD?	The definitions for this Failure Mode is outlined in the Failure Definition and Scoring Criteria - Attachment 38, of the final RFP.
38	Section C - SOW	7.5.3.4	"The Contractor shall ensure each source code repository can accept the Government's 'Fortify Source Code Analyzer' scanning software tool." What is this?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.7.3.3. Hewlett Packard (HP) Fortify 360 Suite Static Code Analyzer
39	Section C - SOW	3.3 Design Understanding Review (DUR)	Planning for 5 days each for SOWM, SRR, and DUR meetings which seems excessive. Is the Govt open to reducing the meeting to a 1day event for each? Are we to understand that there be not be a Govt approval (go/no go) associated with this meeting?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.3 and Attachment 2. Anticipated duration of the meetings and reviews outlined in Section C.3 is based on what is expected to be accomplished.
40	Section C - SOW	3.11 MS (C) Prep mtgs/Supt	Is there an anticipated duration of the meetings and/or the expected labor hours input by the contractor? Will you specify the level of support that you are expecting and the disciplines required to be in attendance?	Refer to final RFP, Section 3.11 for clarification.
41	Section C - SOW	page 11, 5.4.3	The contractor's design is expected to achieve all the requirements in the JLTV Purchase Description per language in this para. It appears to conflict with Section 1.3 where tiers (1-10) are provided to allow for system level trades. Please clarify.	Refer to final RFP. Section A provides guidance on what the Tiering of the Purchase Description means. Final RFP does not require all PD requirements to be met.
42	Section C - SOW	9.2.1 RAM Predictions	MMBHMf is referenced, Is the there also a MMBOMF requirement as well?	No.
43	Section C - SOW	11 Configuration Mgmt	How firm is the USG on requiring an all new Parts Numbering system that incorporates alpha-numeric prefixes related to subsystem ID and suffixes related to Configuration level? Just for POP/EMD but production also? Why does USG "care" what our internal PN system looks like? This requirement will drive excessive and unnecessary cost	This was removed from Section C.11. Refer to final RFP.
44	Section C - SOW	12.3 CAD/CAE Technical Data Deliveries	PTC Pro/Engineer format specified for CAD/CAE. Is Unigraphics (UG) format acceptable? Presently our designs are in Unigraphics. Will the government except a stepped out JT version to bring into their Pro/Engineer system?	No, the Government will not accept a stepped out JT version. Refer to final RFP, CDRLs A052 and A053, and Attachments 28 & 29.
45	Section C - SOW	17.1.2 Shakedown Testing	What are the current Government approved non-Government test sites that can be used for Shakedown and PD conformance testing?	Refer to final RFP. There is no requirement for approval of Shakedown test sites, and PD conformance testing has been deleted.
46	Section C - SOW	17.1.2 Shakedown Testing	Will Shakedown mileage count towards RAM?	No.
47	Section C - SOW	17.3.1 Contractor Test	Contractor durability and performance testing starts at same time as USG. First CAP for corrections is 2 to 3 months later. What is purpose of the Contractor conducting these tests? If the intent is to uncover possible issues, there does not appear to be sufficient time to analyze and correct issues prior to USG testing.	It is the Government's intent in having contractor conduct certain testing to inform the kind of failures that could be anticipated prior to Government-run RAM testing. It may help both KTR and GOV to anticipate these issues prior to CAP 1.
48	Section C - SOW	17.4 Contractor Facilities at Test Sites	USG will provide office space only 7 days before vehicle delivery. And SSP is due 7 days before vehicle delivery. This is insufficient time to set up office, get SSP organized and hit the ground running. Will USG consider allocating this office space earlier?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.17.4: the Government will provide 14 days prior to vehicle delivery.

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
49	Section C - SOW	19.3 - TIR Response Time	In the interest of timely responses to minimize test down time, will the Govt commit to releasing the TIR to the Contractor for critical and major incidents within 48 hours?	No, the PMO will not enter into any contracts pertaining to TIR release times. TIR release times are specified in DA PAM 73-1, Section V-4.
50	Section C - SOW	21 Facility Vehicle	Is dynamic testing permitted on the Facility Vehicle when it is "to be stored on the Contractor's property?"	Refer to final RFP, Section C.21 for clarification.
51	Section C - SOW	para 3.4 - IBR	What benefit is gained from an IBR at the SOWM? This appears to be too early?	Refer to final RFP, Section 3.2 and Section 4.5.1. For planning purposes, the IMS Review is anticipated to be held in conjunction with the SOWM.
52	Section C - SOW	17.5.3 Subject Matter Expert (SME)	Is 72 hours sufficient time frame to get SME boots on the ground in AUS?	There is no Australian/OCONUS requirements in the final RFP.
53	Section C	C.7.6	It is assumed that the JLTV project office will sponsor/support any Cross domain H/W or S/W (where the contractor has justified the need) that requires Government sponsorship for certification and inclusion on the UCDMO peak processor throughput and utilization? Pg 20 para. 7.6 SOW	Refer to final RFP. There is no longer a requirement for Cross domain solution during EMD.
54	Section C	C.24.2.2	Do COTS products need to be redesigned (driving up costs) to meet the Anti-tampering requirements? Pg 55 Para. 24.2.2	Only if it is to be expected the COTs would trigger CT/CPI should AT provisions be considered early on in the system design process to minimize costs and to not adversely impact schedule.
55	Section C	C.7.6	How will the government measure (what tool) peak processor throughput and utilization? Pg 20 para. 7.6 SOW	Refer to final RFP Section C.7.4. The Contractor shall track these metrics, and the Government does not prescribe tools for the tracking and reporting of electrical architecture metrics.
56	Section C	C.21	SOW Section 21 defines a "Facility Vehicle" to be kept at the contractor site. Is this the same vehicle described in attachment 37 as GP vehicle #8?	Refer to final RFP Section C.21 and Attachment 37.
57	Section C	Section C, General	Does the government have a preferred list of models and databases such as Logistics Management Information (LMI), Reliability, Maintainability, Provisioning and Technical Manual Data, as well as Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM) and Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) tools identified for JLTV EMD Phase?	The Government does not have a "preferred" listing of models and databases. The only exception is the COMPASS model, mandated by the Army for conducting the LORA. The Government has recommended reference documents, models, and databases within Section C that may used these to meet specific requirements applicable to EMD (e.g, SAE JA 1011/1011). The Contractor may wish to further discuss the use of other models or databases during IPT meetings.
58	Section C	Section C, 14.2, page 30 of 56	SOW calls out use of CAD manikins with equipment, but no list of equipment is provided. Can the government please provide a list of equipment to avoid potential conflict with PDFOV-3169 (see Annex N question below)?	The 2015 JACK model must be used for the Warfighter Workspace Analysis CDRL. The 2015 JACK model reflects a combat-equipped manikin (Personal Protection Equipment (PPE)). PDFOV-3169 does not correspond and is not related to this CDRL.
59	Section C	Section C, 15, page 31 of 56	This paragraph requires all 12 ILS elements be planned and implemented. Does the government intend on executing this paragraph in its entirety or only the subordinate paragraphs	Yes. The Contractor is required to describe the overall logistic support concept and the appropriate planning for an ILS program. In addition, the specific activities of the 12 ILS/IPS elements shall be addressed where applicable to supporting EMD
60	Section C	16.2, page 36 of 56, Attachment 36	Will the government provide enough GFE assets to populate the SIL, the CM vehicle and the integration and verification that will occur at the build location?	Yes. Please refer to final RFP, Attachment Attachment 37
61	Section C	17.3.1, page 38 of 56	It is not clear the split between Contractor and USG testing post delivery. Will there be a revised Attachment 37 providing a timeline, location of the test sites and a color coded legend denoting whether the Contractor or USG is doing the test?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 37.
62	Section C	17.3.2, page 39 of 58	Assuming 3 months RAM testing can be conducted at a Contractor site, can the USG provide the instructions on how to have the site certified?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.17.3.1 for criteria that the Government is going to consider before approving a test site.

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
63	Section C	20, page 51 of 56	Is the USG open to the cost saving idea of applying the Fastening and Joint Management scope to only those fasteners with Special Characteristics (i.e. safety critical), recognizing that a contractor's internal processes could be certified to a level that will ensure all other fasteners will appropriately satisfy/exceed required standards?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.20 . There is no longer a requirement and this section is RESERVED.
64	Section C	1.3, page 2 of 56	Will the USG provide a scoring model with respect to PD 2.9A requirements tiering?	Refer to final PD, Section A for guidance on tiering of the EMD Purchase Description.
65	Section C	17.3.1, 17.5.2, 17.5.5, pages 38,42 & 43 of 56	Could the number of SSPs, test sites and FSRs required be provided to better delineate our proposals?	Refer to final RFP, Section 17.3 and Section C.17.5.3. There is no longer a requirement to deliver SSP. The Contractor shall determine the number of FSRs required and parts needed to support and maintain vehicle during test. Refer to Attachment 37 for list of test sites and anticipated GOV test schedule.
66	Section C	C.17.1.6, C.17.3, C.19	<p>* Section C.17.1.6 "System-Level Verification Test Refurbishment", subsection c, provides that "The Contractor shall make all changes, modifications, and repairs to the JLTV test assets necessary to correct deficiencies identified during testing."</p> <p>* Section C.17.3 "Government Testing" makes no mention of correction of deficiencies in connection with "Contractor-Performed [Government] Testing" of GFE vehicles, and requires the Contractor to "document and provide records of all test events and deficiencies. . ." (Section C.17.3.1, et seq).</p> <p>* Section C.19 "Test Deficiencies/Failures" outlines the process and procedures to address test deficiencies and failures identified during Government testing, but does not assign responsibility for correcting deficiencies.</p> <p>QUESTION: Does the Government intend that all corrections of defects identified during Government Testing (Sec. C.17.3 et seq) are to be authorized and funded under Work Directives issued under Section C.25 "Option - Additional Level of Effort" inclusive of all Non Recurring Engineering costs related to correction of test deficiencies?</p>	No. Refer to final RFP, Section C.25. "This effort is not to be utilized for repairs or vehicle improvements covered under FACARs or TIR process that result from normal testing or any other repair specified within base contract of statement of work."
67	Section C	C.17.3.2.1	<p>"Corrective Action Period (CAP)" requires the Contractor "to utilize CAPs to implement design updates previously reviewed with the Corrective Action Review Team (CART) as described in Section C.19. CAP duration and timing are defined in the CAP Execution Plan (Attachment 0042)."</p> <p>QUESTION: When will Attachment 0042 "CAP Execution Plan" be available?</p>	All documents are released with the final RFP
68	Section C	7.2.3 & 13.6.1, page 19/29 of 56	The SOW addresses waivers in paragraph 7.2.3-Mil Grade Connector Waivers and 13.6.1-Exceptions to Hazardous Materials Reqmts. Does the Government want approval rights on all other waiver requests?	The Government does not anticipate providing relief of contractual requirements outside the two areas addressed.
69	Section C	SOW Sections 7.5.3.1, 3.3, and Attachment 002	The customer supplied IMP (Attachment 002) states the IA Baseline Scans are to be "Reviewed" at DUR (120 days ARO), but SOW section 7.5.3.1 states that the states the IA Baseline scan is to be completed NLT 180 days ARO. Which document dates take precedent?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2. See IMP definition of "reviewed". "Reviewed" does not require the item to be completed, but should be discussed in its current state. The SOW or CDRLs state when work is required to be complete.
70	Section C	Section C, 15.8, page 34 of 56	Paragraph 15.8 specifies principle end items that require a data plate containing UID markings. Are these the only items that require UID marking? If not, please specify what additional items require UID marking?	Refer to final RFP, Section 15.7, Clause 252.211-7003, and Attachment 1 (Purchase Description).

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
71	General	N/A	Will the government allow contractors time and access to do a limited amount of development work on the assets once they are delivered to the government?	The contractor will have access to the test vehicles at the Correction Action Periods (CAP) 1 and 2 to make design changes/improvements. Configuration changes can be made at contractor's discretion, but will be at the contractor's risk of invalidating prior testing. Changes outside of the CAPs will only be considered where safety or deadlining of vehicles is at stake. The contractor will have full access and control of the facilities vehicle throughout government testing.
72	Section E - Inspect. & Accept.	1	Will Each vehicle require repetitive P.D. Tests, inspections, Certifications and Analyses performed or can Common PD requirements be waived to save time and costs? Will Common Certification and Analyses be considered for a one time submission?	Certifications & Analysis are CDRL deliverables pursuant to final RFP, Section C.17.2. Also, refer to final RFP, Section C.1.2 that states "All Contract Data Requirements List (CDRLs) shall cover each configuration by specifically addressing any unique differences in the configurations. One CDRL submission may address all configurations "
73	Section E - Inspect. & Accept.	2.1 Quality Management System 2.4 Supplier Quality Assurance Program	<i>Section 2.1 states "The quality system shall, as a minimum, be third party certified to ISO 9001:2008. TS-16949:2009 compliance is required for those clauses specifically identified in the Scope of Work." While 2.4 states "The Contractors supplier quality assurance program shall be compliant with ISO/TS 16949:2009..."</i> This appears to be a conflict in requirements. Is the intent of the RFP to require that the contractor have a supplier quality plan that meets the portion of TS 16949 dealing with supplier quality management system development, paragraph 7.4.2.1 of the TS document or more?	Refer to final RFP, Section E, clause 52.246-11.
74	Section E - Inspect. & Accept.	2.1 Quality Management System	Please clarify what benefit is gained by using the TS - 16949-2009 vs ISO 9001-2008?	Refer to final RFP, Section E, clause 52.246-11. Not requiring certification to TS - 16949-2009.
75	Section F - Del. & Perf.	2.2 Armor Coupons	Within this section it is stated "based on a review of the armor recipes that provided by the Contractor, the Government will inform the Contractor how many coupons are required for each armor recipe. The required number of coupons for some recipes may be less that the quantities identified above." At what time will we notified if fewer coupon quantities can be provided for certain armor recipes?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.18 and Section F for requirements, quantities and timing of delivery of coupons.
76	Section F - Del. & Perf.	2.2.1 Transparent Armor	Will TA coupons be required if the recipe (Not used on the TD phase) has been successfully tested within the TARDEC SABL?	Refer to final RFP, Section C.18 and Section F for requirements, quantities and timing of delivery of coupons.
77	Section F - Del. & Perf.	2.2.5EFP Armor	When would the government EFP recipe be provided?	It is being released as an addendum to Annex E (CLASSIFIED). Please refer to website for instructions to obtain access to CLASSIFIED information.
78	Section F - Del. & Perf.	2.3 Ballistic Armor Structures	What variants are the ballistic structures?	Refer to final RFP, Section F.2.3. The ballistic structures are to correlate to the delivered JLTV-GP.
79	Section F	2.2.5, page 1	This paragraph suggests the contractor has an option to provide an EFP kit solution. Is this pricing part of the \$52M. In other words, how will pricing of one contractor who provides an EFP solution be judged against a contractor who doesn't?	EFP protection kit solution is required. Contractor has option to use Government provided EFP solution or their own. If they choose their own, coupons will be required.
80	Section F	2.2, page 1	Why does the SOW require contractor transparent and opaque armor coupons to be all be delivered 60 days after CA? Delivery of the blast hull is 5 months after CA.	Test schedule structured to complete coupon testing and obtain results prior to hull testing, which drives the coupon delivery dates.
81	General	N/A	In reading the draft JLTV proposal I did not see a reference to a "Buy American" clause – will the "Buy American" clause apply to this effort?	The Buy American - Act and Balance Programs, Clause 252.225-7001 is included in Section I of the final RFP.

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
82	Sections G, H, I, Misc Attachments (0030, 0032,0033, 0034, 0035)		(Q) When will the remaining Draft RFP sections and attachments be provided? Some of the missing attachments may drastically expand the scope of work in various disciplines.	All documents are released with the final RFP
83	Section L - Gen. Prop. Info.	L.5.2.1 IMS Proposal	Does the government want the schedule in the same format as the TD proposal? (Time phased accomplishments that are logically linked and resource loaded). Or, can the schedule be IPT based with control accounts (with scope and budget baselined) and have the schedule reference the IMP, SOW, WBS and Control Account?	The primary structure of the schedule is the WBS (refer to Attachment 8 of final RFP). The format and required data fields are defined in Attachment 0049.
84	Section L - Gen. Prop. Info.	8 Volume 5	What level or version of MS Office do you wish supplied information in? Correct and matching versions will mitigate potential transfer/translation issues.	Refer to final RFP, Section L.1.3. All MS files shall be 2003/2007 compatible unless otherwise indicated.
85	Section L	L.1.1, page 1	Will the website providing proposal submission instructions be operational anytime soon? http://contracting.tacom.army.mil/acqinfor/ebidnotice.htm	All proposal instructions are found in Section L of the final RFP.
86	Section L	L.5.1	Unit Manufacturing Cost (UMC) Sub-factor b- Production Configurations & Quantities, c- Production rates over an 8 year planning horizon We understand that the EMD contract will require the delivery of five trailers. We would like to request additional information regarding trailer quantities for LRIP and the five follow on years of production. Section L.5.1 defines the vehicle quantities, but does not provide any information regarding the JLTV trailers.	Refer to final RFP, Attachment KK for the Manufacturing Quantity Assumptions for UMC evaluation. Trailer quantity in P&D is currently zero (0).
87	Section L & M	L.7.3.2.3, L.7.4, L.7.4(2), L.9.4 and M.4.4.2(b)(2)	Is it acceptable to propose the substitution of DFARS clause 252.219-7004, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Test Program), in lieu of 252.219-7003, Small Business Subcontracting Plan and 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, whereby any resulting contract would prescribe to 252.219-7004?	DFARS clause 252.219-7004 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Test Program) will appear in the resulting contract and apply to the contractor if it is an active participant in the DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan Test Program. DFARS clause 252.219-7003 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (DoD Contracts) and FAR clause 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan will remain in the contract under such circumstances because the contractor's Subcontracting Plan responsibilities may flow down to one or more subcontractors that are not Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan Test Program participants.
88	Section L	L.5.1, pages 6-7	How many trailers will be required in production?	Refer to final RFP, Section L. The current assumptions is currently zero (0).
89	Section L	L.1.5, page 3	Presupposing the RFP is released on 02 December and the proposal is due 45 days after, the due date would fall on 16 January 2012, which is a national holiday. Would the due date fall back to the preceding Friday, the 13th, or to the next business day, the 17th? What if the 45 day response time falls on a weekend, when would the proposal be due (Friday before or Monday after)?	It is not the Government's intention to close the RFP on a weekend or national holiday. However, The RFP contains clause 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors -- Competitive Acquisition, which addresses RFP due dates that fall on weekends or holidays.
90	Section L	9.11, page 17	Are you looking for the template formats in accordance with the DFARS Clause 252.234-7003 (b) be provided after contract award, or with the proposal per volume 6, Proposal Terms and Conditions?	Refer to final RFP. Section L refers to Proposal submissions. Section C addresses requirements for after award.
91	Section L	5.1. , page 6	Will a template be provided that better defines UMC? An answer was provided in the After Action Report from the 1-on-1 mtgs , wherein it states "All Production affordability cost targets (AUMC, UMC) are intended to represent the price to the Government, not the cost to manufacture. This is intended to be clarified on a final RFP." Since we are currently pricing, it would be helpful if the USG could provide the template prior to final RFP release.	Refer to final RFP, Attachment KK - Unit Manufacturing Cost Estimate Template.

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
92	Section L	L.3, pages 4-5	Are Contractors prevented from teaming up with another company as that company's Subcontractor with the assumption that both teams could potentially be offered awards?	Refer to final RFP, Section M.1.1 for clarification.
93	Section L	Production Configuration Quantities and Densities	Paragraph L.5.1(b) of the draft RFP states that the total vehicle quantity is 20,750. It further states that the GP makes up 37.7% of that or 7,793 vehicles. However, 37.7% of 20,750 is 7,823, not 7,793. Further, 3.2% of 20,750 is 664, not 674 as stated for SP; 18.1% of 20,750 is 3,756, not 3,754 as stated for HGC; 4.6% of 20,750 is 955, not 964 as stated for CCWC; 1.5% of 20,750 is 311, not 315 as stated for C2OTM; and 34.9% of 20,750 is 7,242, not 7,250 as stated for UTL. Which production numbers are correct for each of the configurations? (See response to 208A)	Final RFP, the Production Configuration and Quantities to be used during evaluation are outlined in Attachment KK.
94	Section L & M	Section L & M Attachment	How does the Government anticipate the calculation of UMC; is it the average of all anticipated production GP vehicle orders? Or, is it the 12,000th unit delivered (after realizing all growth curves, efficiencies, etc)?	Refer to final RFP, Section L.5.1(a) and L.5.1(b).
95	Section L	L.5.1 (a) & L.5.1 (b) Conflict,	Section (a) states that the UMC is based solely on Base GP vehicle, whereas Section (b) says that for the UMC estimate "the Offeror shall assume the following production configuration quantities and densities. . ." and provides configurations of GP, SP, HGC, CCWC, C2OTM and UTL and respective quantities. Will this be clarified or removed?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment KK and Section L.5.1(a). The RFP is only evaluating UMC for the JLTV-GP, but all known production quantities and assumptions are provided to allow offerors to account for amortization of non-recurring costs.
96	Section L	L.5.1 (c)	Do we assume a Multi-Year Buy for UMC?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment KK for the Manufacturing Quantity Assumptions for UMC evaluation.
97	Section L	Section L.5.1(e) & Section C SOW 4.1	Will Attachment 0006 be in a standard Automated Cost Estimating Integrated Tools (ACEIT) Model format?	No
98	Section L	Section L.8.4	Will "Attachment XX" be templates that need to be populated? When will we receive them?	All attachments have been released with the final RFP.
99	Section L	L.1.1, page 1; and Section L.6.3, page 9	When must the Past Performance Questionnaire be submitted? Section L.1.1 c indicates the Past Performance Questionnaire will be due no later than five (5) days before the due date of the solicitation; whereas section L.6.3 indicates the same Past Performance Questionnaire will be due as soon as possible, but no later than the RFP closing date.	Refer to final RFP L.1.1 and L.6.3. Past Performance Questionnaire will be due as soon as possible, but no later than 5 days before the RFP closing date.
100	Section L	L.1.4.2 & L.1.4.3 Point of Contact Information for Booz Allen Hamilton	Will updated Point of Contact (POC) information be provided for Government Support Contractor (GSC) Booz Allen Hamilton? We were notified by their McLean, VA, office that they were not involved with the JLTV Program and they thought that Proprietary Information Agreements (PIAs) should be directed to their Detroit office for signature execution. They could not locate Mr. Nate Clark. (C) Time sensitive request as executed PIAs are due 20 days prior to proposal submittals.	Final RFP, Section L does not notify use of a Government Support Contractor.
101	Section L	L.9.6 b)	Does this apply to just Offeror? Or do we extend to Major Subcontractors as defined in M.3.4 for subcontractors exceeding \$5M contract value or providing work that is critical to the whole?	Refer to final RFP Section L. This has been removed. Contract type (firm fixed price and fixed-price-level-of-effort for Option) does not require an approved Accounting system.
102	Section L&M	L.9.10 and M.3.4	Question refers to the references quoted above: Q: Must the major Subcontractors (≥\$5M per year) have BOTH the EVMS and the DSS Facility clearance, or simply just the EVMS?	Refer to the final RFP. There is no longer an EVMS requirement. Application of EVMS to subcontract(s) is at the discretion of prime contractors, in accordance with its own EVM System. With regard to DSS Facility clearance, it is not driven by dollar value. If a contractor/subcontractor's facility will be handling classified information, then a DSS facility clearance is required, pursuant to the DD 254 (Attachment 44).

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
103	Section L&M	M.3.4	Q1: Is the Government equating the "EVMS documentation per DFARS 252.234.7001" with the documentation of "A DCMA approved Accounting System or a system operating under a DCMA approved Corrective Action Plan"? Q2: In a Pre-Award Survey or in a request for financial, technical, production, or managerial background information related to the EVMS requirements, must the Offeror show the EVMS solution currently in-use by another existing Government contract, or simply the capability to implement the EVMS solution beginning with the JLTV contract?	Refer to final RFP, there is no longer an EVMS requirement.
104	Section L&M	L.9.10 and M.3.4	If an Offeror (or its major subcontractors) does not have a DCMA approved EVMS and submits a plan for compliance in the RFP Response, by what milestone/date must an Offeror show compliance with the EVMS guidelines: EMD contract award or Production contract award?	Refer to final RFP, there is no longer an EVMS requirement.
105	Section L&M	L.9.10 and M.3.4	Does the Government require a specific software solution (for example: DELTEK's "Cobra" module and "Open Plan" scheduling tool), or simply a solution that meets all of the requirements in DFARS 252.234.7001 and described per DFARS 252.234.7002?	No. Refer to final RFP, CDRL A012. DiD requires CoTS, CDRL requires delivery in a *.csv format and Contractor native tool format.
106	Section M - Basis of Award	p 25, 4.2.1.c	What is meant by a step down factor. What is included / excluded (e.g. NRE?)	Refer to final RFP, Section L. This was deleted in the final RFP.
107	Section M - Basis of Award	p 25, 4.5.1.2	Section M.4.5.1.2 lists as an option, additional level of effort of XX hours. Are these hours/costs part of the \$52M funding limit, although the option may not be exercised?	Refer to final RFP, Section M.2, and M.3.3. The funding limit was raised to \$65M and only applies to the base contract CLINS, not the Option.
108	Section M - Basis of Award	p.20, 3.3	Will a proposal that exceeds \$52M but offers a cost sharing provision which limits the Govt cost to \$52M eligible for award?	Refer to final RFP Section M.3.3. Final contract type to be Firm Fixed Price.
109	Attach FF	Table	This list contains PD references that do not exist (deleted) from PD 2.9a. Only four of the 34 requirements are categorized as tier 1,2, or 3. Was this your intent?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment FF and Section A (Executive Summary) for guidance on Tiering.
110	Attachment SB		<p>"If the prime contractor is Joint Venture or has a Teaming Agreement, the members could be considered primes or 1st tier subcontractors according to the legal agreement. Include the dollars for any members that are considered primes under each applicable category. "</p> <p>This appears to unfairly penalize unpopulated Joint Ventures (JV) whose agreement is between Large Business members. An unpopulated JV would subcontract all business directly to its members. That is, 100 percent of the contract costs will be incurred through subcontracts with JV members. When both / all JV members are large businesses, all small business opportunities are at the Second Tier level. The JV's resulting "goal" for Tier 1 small business subcontracting is zero percent, thus putting the JV at an unfair disadvantage for purposes of the Government's comparative evaluation of its proposal.</p> <p>Such an outcome would be especially unfair if the JV has a demonstrated commitment to aggressive small business participation below Tier 1.</p> <p>Q: How does the Government intend to address this inequity in its comparative evaluation of proposals for the JLTV EMD Phase?</p>	It is the structure of the JV and the agreement of the JV partners that may affect the Small Business Participation evaluation. The structure of the JV is the JV partners choice. We will evaluate all offerors, whether JV or not, the same regarding their SBP.

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
111	Section CDRL's	Blocks 16 of multiple CDRLs	Block 6 descriptors within block 16 Remarks are inconsistent. E.G. Supportability IPT is identified as SIPT on some CDRLs and SPT on others, Test & Evaluation IPT is referred to as Product Assurance Test & Evaluation IPT on some CDRLs and merely Test & Evaluation IPT on others, Test & Evaluation is identified as TE on some CDRLs and T&E on others. Please use consistent labelling.	Refer to final RFP, CDRLs.
112	Section CDRL's	A052	In what format does CDRL A052 need to be delivered?	Refer to final RFP, CDRL A052 block 14.
113	Section CDRL's	A026	When will Blk 16 be updated (Block 4)?	Refer to final RFP, CDRL. This CDRL is removed.
114	Section CDRL's	A029	When will Blk 16 be updated (Block 4)?	Refer to final RFP, CDRL. This CDRL is removed.
115	Section CDRL's	A045, Block 4	Are reliability allocations and predictions required for only Hardware Mission Failures (HMF) or also for Essential Function Failures (EFF)?	PD requirement is for MMBHMF, which is based on OMF failures. So growth curves and growth tracking will be just for Hardware Mission Failures. EFF will still be tracked, but does not count against the MMBHMF PD requirement. However, the Contractor is expected to deliver EFF predictions as part of their requirement to <u>provide Reliability Predictions</u> .
116	Section CDRL's	A046, Block 4	Are reliability growth planning curves required for only Hardware Mission Failures (HMF) or also for Essential Function Failures (EFF)?	PD requirement is for MMBHMF, which is based on OMF failures. So growth curves and growth tracking will be just for Hardware Mission Failures. EFF will still be tracked, but does not count against the MMBHMF PD requirement. However, the Contractor is expected to deliver EFF predictions as part of their requirement to <u>provide Reliability Predictions</u> .
117	Section CDRL's	A047, Block 4	Will reliability growth be tracked for only Hardware Mission Failures (HMF) or also for Essential Function Failures (EFF)?	PD requirement is for MMBHMF, which is based on OMF failures. So growth curves and growth tracking will be just for Hardware Mission Failures. EFF will still be tracked, but does not count against the MMBHMF PD requirement. However, the Contractor is expected to deliver EFF predictions as part of their requirement to <u>provide Reliability Predictions</u> .
118	Section CDRL's		When will tailored Data Item Descriptions (DIDs) be available?	Contractor is responsible for obtaining DIDs. The CDRLs describes how the DID is tailored. DIDS can be found online at HTTPS://assist.daps.dla.mil/quicksearch/
119	Section CDRL's	Attach 32, 33	Current documentation missing Attachments 0032 & 0033 called out in HFE CDRLs A057 & A058 (respectively). When will these documents be available?	Refer to final RFP, CDRL A057 & A058.
120	CDRLs	CDRL A038	CDRL A038 calls for a Software Development plan and a configuration Management plan. Are these to be formal plans for the JLTV program? If so by what DIDS should they be developed?	The Software Development Plan and Configuration Management Plan delivered as a part of CDRL A038 should describe the processes and plans used to execute the JLTV EMD contract. These processes are expected to be reflective of the Offerer's CMMI certification level. It is not intended to require specific DIDS for these plans.
121	Miscellaneous Attachments	Miscellaneous Attachments	Will we receive a draft DD 254 and/or JLTV EMD Security Classification Guide?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 44 which is the DD 254. The Security Classification Guide has been distributed to all potential offerors who requested and were eligible to receive CLASSIFIED data. If a potential offeror in possession of CLASSIFIED data has not received a copy of this, please contact our mailbox: usarmy.detroit.acc.mbx.wrn-jltv-rfp@mail.mil

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
122	Attachment 0005	Attachment 0005 WBS, Lines 40-48	<p>Referring to lines 40 - 48, the following WBS is shown for the JLTV-GP:</p> <p>4 01.01.01.08 Body / Cab</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.01 Seat / Restraint Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.02 Dashboard / Instrument Panel & Console</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.03 Storage Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.04 Body Hardware</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.05 Door Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.06 Rear/Cargo Area</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.07 GFE Kit Integration</p> <p>5 01.01.01.08.08 Subsystem Design & Integration</p> <p>Subsequent configurations have the following WBS (JLTV-SP shown)</p> <p>4 01.01.02.08 Body / Cab</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.01 Seat / Restraint Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.02 Dashboard / Instrument Panel & Console</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.03 Storage Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.04 Body Hardware</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.05 Door Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.06 Anti-tamper Systems</p> <p>5 01.01.02.08.07 Gunner's Sling / Seat Assembly</p> <p>Note that these differ in the last few highlighted elements (in red). The Rear/Cargo Area, GFE Kit Integration and Subsystem Design & Integration appear for the JLTV-GP only. In addition, Anti-tamper Systems and Gunner's Sling / Seat Assembly appear</p>	The CSDR Plan (Refer to final RFP Attachment 5) and the SE/IMS WBS (Refer to final RFP Attachment 8) were inadvertently combined in the Draft release. This question pertains to Attachment 8; the Body/Cab section is now the same for each of the three vehicle base platforms.
123	Attachment 0005	Attachment 0005 WBS, line 492: 01.02.03 Heavy Guns Carrier - RHO / (JLTV-HGC-RHO)	There are no sub elements associated with this configuration. We assume that the sub elements should be repeated in the same fashion as the other configurations. Is this correct?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 5. Vehicle configurations are no longer separately identified in the CDSR Plan.
124	Attachment 0005	Attachment 0005 WBS, Line 558: 01.02.03 Utility Vehicle - RHO / (JLTV-UTL-RHO)	Referring to the same WBS designation is used as in line 492. For consistency we assume this should be: 01.02.06 Utility Vehicle - RHO / (JLTV-UTL-RHO) and subsequent sub-element should be numbered accordingly. In addition, line 622 would change from 01.02.04 RHO Vehicle Kits to 01.02.07 RHO Vehicle Kits with sub elements numbered accordingly. Is this correct?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 5. Vehicle configurations are no longer separately identified in the CDSR Plan.
125	Attachment 0005	Attachment 5, DD1921-2 CSDR Plan	Is the 1921-2 Progress Curve Report a contract requirement? The requirement is identified in Section C and in the CDRLS, but is not marked in Attachment 0005, the CSDR Plan.	DD 1921-2 is not included in the final RFP (formerly CDRL A006 in the Draft RFP).
126	Attachment 0005	Attachment 5, DD1921-3 CSDR Plan	Is the 1921-3 Progress Contract Business Data Report a contract requirement? The requirement is identified in Section C and in the CDRLS, but is not marked in Attachment 0005, the CSDR Plan.	Yes, it is a requirement but is not part of the CSDR plan. The DCARC website has the format for submittal @ http://dcarc.pae.osd.mil/Files/Policy/dd1921-3.xls
127	Attachment 0005	WBS Dictionary	Will the Government provide a WBS dictionary to further clarify Attachment 0005?	No. The WBS index is provided at Attachment 5 of the final RFP. The WBS data dictionary is the responsibility of the Contractor. Refer to final RFP, CDRL A011
128	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will the RFP IMP be formatted to include PE, SA, AC?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2.
129	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will the RFP IMP be formatted to have one tab per event?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2.
130	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will the RFP IMP contain an IMP Definition of the Program Events?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2.
131	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will a glossary of IMP noun definitions be provided?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2.

JLTV - Draft RFP (October 2011 Draft RFP release) Question and Answers

#	DRFP Document Title	Applicable Reference (e.g. Paragraph #)	Question	Response
132	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	The Contractor shall utilize the IMP and contract deliverable dates to develop their IMS baseline. Will the RFP contain a table with the contractor deliverable dates?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2.
133	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will the RFP IMP have a unique IMP number for each PE, SA, and AC, thus supporting the hierarchy of PE -> SA -> AC?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2.
134	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will the IMP have SOW and/or WBS references to provide traceability?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2. There are no SOW paragraph or WBS references.
135	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Will the IMP be in a format similar to what was provided for the TD Phase?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 2
136	Attachment 2	Attach 2 - IMP	Are all the Reports and Assessments indicated in the IMP for 1 variant or all variants?	Refer to final RFP, Section C. All reports and assessments are defined in the Statement of Work.
137	Attach 0036 - GFE		Quantity per Contract is for Phase 1 and Phase 2. "Phase 1" and "Phase 2" do not appear in SOW. Q: Is Phase 1 EMD and Phase 2 Production & Deployment?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 36. Phase 1 and Phase 2 are defined in the notes section of Attachment 36.
138	Attachment 0036	GFE List	With respect to the Government Furnished turret and GPK, can the customer provide packaging requirements and weight?	GFE and GFI will be provided IAW Attachment 36 (notes at bottom provide detail on provision of this information), and in accordance with the final RFP, Section C.16.
139	Attachment 0036	GFE List	What needs to be installed on the 3 blast hulls for testing?	Refer to final RFP. Section C.18.2.2 reflects current requirements, including details for hull and armored chassis configuration.
140	Attachment 037	Page 2, Attachment 0036	RHINO' is not identified as GFE nor is its application shown by Attachment 0037. 'RHINO' does appear on the GFE, Attachment 0036. Will 'RHINO' be provided on a GFE basis and what is its expected application?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 36. RHINO is not listed on GFE list.
141	Attachment 037	Page 2, Attachment 0036	Saber (USMC) is identified as GFE, applicable to CCWC2. It does not appear on the Attachment 0036 GFE list. Is Saber required and will Saber be provided as GFE?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 36. Saber is not listed on GFE list.
142	Attachment 037	Vehicle Configuration and Allocation Matrix	For the six vehicles shown for RAM Testing, how many miles are planned for each of the vehicles?	Refer to final RP, Section 17.3.2.1 and Attachment 37. 20,000 miles per vehicle is planned on a total of 8 vehicles.
143	Attachment 37	N/A	Attachment 37 column X has vehicle delivery location shown for some as "In-Place". Does that mean these vehicles are kept at the contractor site?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 37; Note ix. It means that the Government is going to take delivery of designated vehicles at the contractor's site.
144	Attachment 37 / Annex K	N/A	Attachment 37 GFE complement does not match Annex K. Are the designations in Attachment 37 just for the minimum test needs? Are we to assume that the full complement in Annex K is the intent for the RFP offering? Will ballast be required to simulate GVW with all Annex K? Will provide Separate input on the as a comment on the discrepancies noted.	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 1. Annex K contains the quantity of each piece of equipment that the vehicle shall be able to integrate, but is not necessarily the EMD vehicle delivery configuration (Attachment 37 of final RFP). Installation of the items in Annex K will not bring the vehicle up to full GVW.
145	Attachment 37	N/A	Attachment 0037 table appears to have an error on it. Does the government agree that CCWC2 will require a CSDU to host the GB GRAM and GFE SW assigned to that vehicle?	Refer to final RFP, Attachment 37 for EMD vehicle delivery configuration.
146	Attachment 37	Attachment 37	How does the government intend to order the vehicles, is the government buying just base vehicle or base vehicles with mission functionality? Are kits assumed to be factory installed or depot options?	For EMD, the final RFP (Attachment 37) defines the delivery configuration of all vehicles. The Purchase Description (Attachment 1 & Annex K) defines the vehicles and their kits.
147	Attachment 0037	Attachment 0037	Is 1 of 20 EMD vehicles Right Hand Only (RHO)? If yes, which variant?	Refer to final RFP. There is no Australian unique requirements in the final RFP, and all deliverable test asset vehicles shall be in LHO.